

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL
OFFICE SPACE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



JUNE 1, 1962

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1962

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
JOHN J. McFALL, California
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
JOHN YOUNG, Texas
FRANK W. BURKE, Kentucky
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California
ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
EDWIN B. DOOLEY, New York
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
PERKINS BASS, New Hampshire
WALTER L. McVEY, Kansas
CARLETON J. KING, New York
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Jr., Ohio
JAMES HARVEY, Michigan
JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania
LOUISE G. REECE, Tennessee

MARGARET R. BEITER, *Chief Clerk*
RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Chief Counsel*
JOSEPH R. BRENNAN, *Engineer-Consultant*
CLIFTON W. ENFIELD, *Minority Counsel*

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been aware for some time of the overcrowded and substandard conditions of Federal office buildings in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

Last August, I asked a group at the Cabinet level to make a study of these problems and come forward with suggestions to deal with them. I have now received their report, and approved it.

I believe you will be interested in this report, and that you may wish to bring it to the attention of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE HISTORY OF THE

—

—

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL OFFICE SPACE

MAY 23, 1962.

Memorandum for—

The Secretary of Commerce;

The Secretary of Labor.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget.

The Administrator of General Services Administration.

The Special Assistant to the President for Cabinet and Departmental Relations.

The Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission.

I have reviewed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space. This report provides a long-needed perspective on Federal office space problems and prospects in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

I am requesting each department and agency head to give immediate study to the report and take appropriate action. Future planning for the acquisition and use of office space is to be guided by the findings and recommendations of this report.

I will appreciate a progress report 1 year from now by the Administrator of General Services with regard to Federal office space and the adoption of improved architectural standards. I should like a similar report on progress from the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission with regard to the improvement of Pennsylvania Avenue.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL OFFICE SPACE

LUTHER H. HODGES, Secretary of Commerce

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, Secretary of Labor

DAVID E. BELL, Director, Bureau of the Budget

BERNARD J. BOUTIN, Administrator, General Services Administration

TIMOTHY J. REARDON, JR., Special Assistant to the President

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	ix
The office space problem in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area....	1
Priorities for meeting critical needs.....	3
Decentralization of Federal activities—Its possibilities and limitations....	6
The role of the General Services Administration in space assignment and utilization.....	9
Guiding principles for Federal architecture.....	11
The redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue.....	12

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the Cabinet meeting on August 4, 1961, you directed that a survey be made of the Government's immediate and long-term space needs, with particular reference to the Greater Washington area. Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, special assistant to the President, organized an ad hoc committee for this purpose consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Administrator of General Services. Mr. Dutton's responsibilities were later assumed by Mr. Timothy J. Reardon, special assistant to the President.

The committee has completed its work and submits for your consideration the attached report and recommendations.

The problem of office space in and around the District of Columbia is acute. With each succeeding year, the needs outpace efforts to catch up. It is no overstatement to say that the existing office space situation is disorderly, inefficient, and wasteful. The lack of adequate, modern permanent facilities for Government agencies has obliged the Government to lease expensive privately owned space on a large scale, and the prospect is for this situation to continue and expand in the near future. Of the 291 buildings occupied by Government agencies in this area, 66 are obsolete Government-owned buildings, 47 are Government-owned temporary buildings, and 129 are leased buildings.

Virtually all of the space in the temporary and obsolete categories is substandard, together with a substantial portion of the leased space. Overcrowding, poor lighting, and poor ventilation are not conducive to efficient work performance, accident prevention, or the career attractiveness of the Federal service.

In the absence of a clearly defined and determined program to overcome these problems, conditions will deteriorate rapidly as a result of continued obsolescence and the growth of Federal employment. We are recommending a plan of action to be accomplished over the next decade which will provide for a minimum of 12 new Federal buildings together with the elimination of existing temporary and obsolete Government-owned buildings.

Few departments and independent agencies regard their current or prospective office space as ideal. For most of them, it is not. Your committee has, however, confined its attention to the most pressing problems and their solution. We recommend that in any long-range improvement program, attention be given to overcoming the most critical deficiencies on a priority basis.

In searching for solutions to the growing congestion of office buildings in the Government community, the committee did not overlook the possibility of easing the pressure on office space through such measures as decentralization or dispersal of Government activities from the Washington area. We understand that at the outset of World War II, a substantial decentralization of activities and person-

nel was undertaken for the purpose of providing room for the emergency agencies. While such a sweeping measure was doubtless justified under the conditions which prevailed at the time, the committee believes that no such major undertaking should be considered now. The disruption of public services, the problems encountered in large-scale relocation of employees and their families, and the costs of removal and resettlement are all considerations which led us to this conclusion. Nevertheless, we believe that a carefully selective approach, based on prudent judgment factors, could identify activities suitable for dispersal or decentralization over a period of years, and as a starting point we have formulated criteria which each department and agency can use in determining the location of functions and activities.

In its survey of existing conditions involving office space assignment and occupancy, the committee had to ask itself how it was possible for such conditions to arise in the first place. We concluded that the General Services Administration has been expected to handle the problem without adequate guidance and without clear responsibility. In every organization, whether private or public, someone must take charge of space management within a framework of broad objectives and guidelines. Within the executive branch, the appropriate arm of the President for these matters is the General Services Administration. The committee has, accordingly, outlined what it conceives to be the proper role and scope of responsibilities of that agency, and recommends that an implementing Executive order be issued in the near future.

A long-range program to improve Federal office space in the Nation's Capital presents an exceptional opportunity to enhance the beauty and dignity of the seat of government. The first consideration, in this respect, should be the adoption of optimum architectural design for new buildings. This is not synonymous with either exuberance or extravagance. Efficient and economical construction will also recognize and incorporate creative architectural designs, and encourage the fine arts. The committee believes strongly that in planning Federal buildings for Washington or other American cities, emphasis should be placed on designs that embody the finest contemporary architectural thought, while carefully avoiding the development of an official style. In our report, we recommend a four-point architectural policy for the Federal Government.

Lastly, your committee expresses the hope that immediate attention will be given to the opportunity which now exists—but will not exist indefinitely—to undertake the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue. As conceived by L'Enfant, the "grand axis" of the city of Washington was to be Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the White House, expressing symbolically both the separation of powers and the essential unity in the American form of government. But Pennsylvania Avenue today is a scene where we find imposing government buildings unhappily contrasted with blight and decay. It is beyond doubt that many existing structures will soon be torn down and replaced. This makes it possible to bring government and private enterprise together in a joint undertaking to plan for the redevelopment of the whole avenue. This combination of effort can result in a concourse which will be lively, friendly, and inviting, as well as

dignified and impressive. Our report contains specific recommendations to bring these results about.

In conclusion, we have found this assignment both challenging and rewarding. We trust that our findings and recommendations will provide a sound basis for improving the efficiency of Government operations and preserving the unique character of our Nation's Capital.

Respectfully,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

DAVID G. BELL,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator of General Services.

T. J. REARDON, JR.,
Special Assistant to the President.

THE OFFICE SPACE PROBLEM IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

The committee's examination of the space problem of the Washington metropolitan area (i.e., the District of Columbia, Alexandria, and the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Montgomery, and Prince Georges) had two objectives:

1. To assess the general adequacy and suitability of space for department and agency operations;
2. To develop guidelines for meeting space requirements and improving the character of space accommodations in the area.

In September 1961, when the committee began its work, there were 189,400 employees in the metropolitan area, occupying a total of 36,565,000 net square feet of space. The space inventory, by type of building, was as follows:

	Number of buildings	Net area (millions of square feet)	Personnel (thousands)
Permanent Government-owned buildings.....	49	22.340	121.7
Temporary Government-owned buildings.....	47	5.655	38.4
Obsolete Government-owned buildings.....	66	3.871	13.1
Leased buildings.....	129	4.699	16.2
Total.....	291	36.565	189.4

The steady growth of personnel in the area since the mid-1930's, combined with a low level of public building construction, have produced a haphazard pattern of space procurement and continued reliance on temporary and obsolete buildings, some of which date from World War I.

Virtually all of the space in the temporary and obsolete categories is substandard. The adverse effect of poor surroundings, poor lighting, and poor ventilation on the more than 50,000 employees housed in these 113 buildings will be intensified as time goes on. The committee also found that a substantial portion of the leased space included in the inventory is barely adequate, and some is clearly substandard.

Space accommodations in the 49 permanent buildings are not in every case adequate, but periodic repair and improvement work together with additional new space to eliminate overcrowding will bring most of this space up to a reasonable standard.

While the committee found substantial evidence of substandard space and overcrowding, an equally important finding was the need for consolidation of space in the interest of administrative efficiency and economy.

As departments and agencies have grown they have had to spread out into many locations, some several miles from the office of the Secretary or the agency head. Moreover, personnel components of bureaus within departments and divisions within agencies are in many

cases widely scattered. Numbers of locations for various departments are: Agriculture, 13; Commerce, 27; Health, Education, and Welfare, 30; Interior, 21; Justice, 16; Labor, 20; State, 19; and Treasury, 25. Although it is not always feasible to house an entire department in one building, and there are cases where separate quarters for certain activities are desirable, nevertheless greater consolidation and reduction in number of locations is indicated if Secretaries are to administer the affairs of their departments efficiently and economically. This is also true of the larger independent agencies such as HHFA and Veterans.

In developing guidelines for meeting space requirements in the area, it is necessary to take into account growth in Federal employment. While some estimates of the average annual increase exceed 6,000, the committee believes that the figure will be closer to 2,000. Accordingly, a figure of 2,000 is used in the committee's projected requirements, with the recognition that this figure may prove to be low as time goes on.

It is also necessary to determine what the ultimate character of the space inventory should be. The committee is strongly of the opinion that all employees should be housed in adequate space. This involves eventual replacement of all temporary and obsolete buildings, and the upgrading of existing permanent, Government-owned space, where this is necessary. The committee also believes that about 10 percent of the inventory should be leased in order to provide flexibility for dealing with new requirements and program changes.

The committee believes that the Federal Government should seek to achieve over a period of, say, 10 years a space inventory which would look like this:

Net area

[Millions of square feet]

	Existing	Objective
Permanent Government-owned buildings.....	22.340	22.340
Temporary Government-owned buildings.....	5.655	
Obsolete Government-owned buildings.....	3.871	
New construction to replace temporary and obsolete buildings, at 175 square feet per person.....		9.013
Leased:		
General purpose.....	2.899	1.800
Special purpose.....	1.800	1.800
New construction to replace general purpose leased space.....		.787
New construction for growth—2,000 per year for 10 years, at 175 square feet per person.....		3.500
Total.....	36.565	39.240

Of the indicated construction requirement of 13,300,000 square feet set forth in the preceding table, about 3.5 million square feet is already under construction (FOB 8, FOB 9, FOB 10, CIA, Bureau of Standards, and Employment Security Building). Another 404,000 square feet has been approved and financed (FOB 7, Court of Claims Building, GPO plant). The HHFA is seeking approval for construction of 652,000 square feet using its FHA reserves. This leaves 8.7 million square feet to be financed from appropriations. If this unfinished construction were, for example, programed over a 10-year period the total cost would be:

Construction costs—8.7 million square feet at \$40 per net square foot ¹	\$348,000,000
Sites for 12 buildings.....	25,000,000
Architect-engineering, supervision, and Government overhead (10 percent).....	35,000,000
Contingencies (5 percent).....	17,000,000
Total.....	425,000,000

¹ Gross square foot costs would be closer to \$25.

Completion of this construction in 10 years would, however, require that appropriations be made by the end of 8 years, or an average of about \$53 million a year. This appropriation experience in recent years is as follows (about \$25 million a year):

Fiscal year 1959:	
FOB 6.....	\$14,000,000
Court of Claims.....	1,200,000
Fiscal year 1960.....	0
Fiscal year 1961:	
FOB 8.....	15,105,000
FOB 9.....	20,031,100
FOB 10.....	38,326,500
Court of Claims.....	6,375,000
Fiscal year 1962:	
FOB 7.....	23,700,000
GPO plant.....	1,545,650
FOB 8 equipment.....	3,800,000
Fiscal year 1963: No funds requested.	

The General Services Administration has prepared a "Ten-Year Construction Plan for Federal Space Requirements in the Washington Metropolitan Area" and this plan follows substantially the objectives outlined above.

The committee recommends that every effort should be made to meet the objectives set forth in a period of 10 years. It recognizes, however, that changing circumstances may produce changes in objectives and that it may not be possible to maintain the consistently high level of financing indicated.

Pending construction of new buildings, the committee believes that the General Services Administration should reassign space and negotiate leases in such a way as to provide the greatest possible consolidation and improvement of accommodations for Federal activity in the Washington metropolitan area.

PRIORITIES FOR MEETING CRITICAL NEEDS

The requirement of 8.7 million net square feet of new construction for which appropriations are required would be met through erection of new buildings and extensions to existing buildings. The specific order in which these new buildings and extensions are to be constructed and the departments and agencies accommodated will depend on many factors and it cannot be established with certainty for a 10- or even a 5-year period. The committee believes, however, that it would be helpful to identify a number of departments and agencies which, because of fragmentation, overcrowding, and poor conditions of space, illustrate dramatically the problems dealt with in this report.

Department of Justice

The Department has 1,367,000 net square feet of space in 16 locations. Only 578,000 of this is in the main Justice Building. The Federal Bureau of Investigation occupies space in seven buildings within the District of Columbia. A new building primarily for the FBI, in addition to relieving congestion and improving efficiency, would also assure greater agency security. A building of about 1 million square feet would release 215,000 square feet in the Justice Building, which, in turn, would release space in the Home Loan Bank Board Building for the expanding staff of the Board. The FBI would release substantial space in the HEW area and in the Old Post Office Building area. The House and Senate Public Works Committees have approved a prospectus for the FBI Building.

Department of Labor

The Department now occupies 684,000 net square feet of space in 20 buildings. Yet only 260,000 square feet of this total is situated in the main Labor Department Building. In view of the Department's expanding employment, consolidation of space is highly important. Construction of additional space would materially improve working conditions, administrative control, and overall efficiency.

Department of Defense

Although the Pentagon Building contains 3,600,000 square feet of space, the Department has another 4,979,000 square feet of general purpose space in 49 locations. Over 3,500,000 square feet are either in temporary or obsolete buildings.

FOB No. 5 in the Southwest Redevelopment area with a floor area of 980,000 square feet has been approved by the Congress for construction and has been earmarked for the use of the Department of Defense. The construction has not been funded, however. Over a 10-year period, two additional buildings of this size will be needed.

Department of State—U.S. Information Agency

With completion of the new State Building, this facility now provides 1,522,000 square feet of space. The Department, however, still has 500,000 square feet in 18 other locations. It would be highly desirable to consolidate all foreign policy operations, including those of USIA, adjacent to the new State Building. USIA now has 390,000 square feet of space in 10 locations.

Construction of additional space close to the new State Building is complicated by plans for park areas, roadways, and university expansion. It is believed, however, that a suitable site could be developed in the area immediately north of Washington Circle.

If this construction cannot be accomplished, alternative plans should be developed by the Administrator of General Services at the earliest possible time.

Department of the Interior

Of the current square footage of 1,195,000, 675,000 is located in the Interior Building. A major problem is the fragmentation of Geological Survey activities—13 locations out of the 21 for the entire Department. There is need for consolidation of Survey space which aggregates approximately 500,000 square feet, and a prospectus for a building to be located in the Washington metropolitan area has been approved by the Senate Public Works Committee.

Department of Commerce

The Department now occupies 3,186,000 square feet of space.

Existing permanent buildings (Main Commerce, 1 million square feet; and FOB No. 3 and No. 4 at Suitland, Md., 550,000) provide a total of 1,550,000 square feet of space. The 825,000 square feet now occupied by the Bureau of Standards are being replaced by a new complex at Gaithersburg, Md. Deducting both of these amounts from the departmental total produces an area of 811,000 square feet which is spread among 23 locations.

The Weather Bureau occupies space in nine buildings, five of which provide poor working conditions. Patent Office quarters in the main building are also overcrowded and recently some operations have had to be moved to leased space. These conditions are regarded as seriously interfering with efficiency of operations. More suitable quarters for these operations are very much needed.

Department of Defense

As mentioned above, over 3,500,000 square feet of DOD space is located in temporary (3,200,000) and obsolete (300,000) space. Additional construction of general purpose office space aggregating 2 million square feet is badly needed. This would also have an important effect on the elimination of inadequate and unsightly temporary buildings.

Veterans' Administration

In addition to its main building on Vermont Avenue and H Street (433,000 square feet) the VA occupies over 300,000 square feet in the old Munitions Building. The agency has made important decentralization moves and its space needs should stabilize around 750,000 square feet. A more efficient consolidation of space at the Soldiers' Home grounds, for example, would be very desirable.

Extension projects which are high priority and which should be fitted into the construction program are:

National Science Foundation

The main building with an area of 70,000 square feet is now entirely inadequate to house agency operations. Eighty thousand additional feet are being utilized in five other locations. An extension is urgently needed.

Internal Revenue Service

Elements of the IRS occupy space in six buildings, much of which is overcrowded. Personnel is also increasing, particularly that needed to support the nationwide automatic data processing program. Construction of an extension is needed.

Department of Agriculture

While the Agriculture main building complex has 1,356,000 square feet, there is an additional 200,000 square feet scattered in 10 locations. Much of this space is obsolete. An extension would add to departmental efficiency.

DECENTRALIZATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—ITS POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS

As the term is used in this report, "decentralization" primarily means the removal of activities from the Washington area to other parts of the Nation, and, to a lesser extent, the dispersal of operations from the central zone of Washington to the suburbs.

In its developments of guidelines for meeting the space requirements of Federal agencies in the Washington metropolitan area, the committee undertook a special evaluation of the decentralization process as a means of reducing these requirements. The evaluation explored the following questions:

1. What are the factors that favor decentralizing Federal activities to other parts of the country?
2. What are the advantages of locating Federal agency activities in the Washington area?
3. What are the criteria which may be used to test the feasibility of removing whole agencies or segments of agencies from or into the Washington area?
4. What policies guide executive branch decentralization activities?
5. How should policies be modified and improved? What effect on Washington area employment can be expected?

The committee found that there are a number of important values to be obtained by decentralization. Decentralization policy when applied to a specific agency or unit has the potential benefits of adaptation to a specific geographical area's needs, coordination at the local level, prompt administration of programs for which basic policies have been established, direct service to the public, availability of adequate office space, and reducing certain management costs.

The committee also found that decentralization must be weighed against other management factors, including the day-to-day needs of the President and Congress, the major policy nature of the work, the need to fix responsibility for agency operations, the requirement that the governmental unit coordinate its activities with those of other organizations, and economies resulting from a specialization of labor or facilities.

Very early in this study it was found that although a decentralization policy is of fundamental political and managerial significance, no general decentralization policy exists today in the executive branch collectively or in the agencies individually. Rather, the present pattern of operations reflects the needs of, and pressures on, individual agencies and their constituent units.

The executive branch is already characterized by a major decentralization of staff and activities. Although most of the department and agency heads are located in the District of Columbia, over 90 percent of Federal employment is located elsewhere throughout the United States. All of the departments and most of the agencies maintain extensive regional and field office organizations. Some agencies or constituents, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration, are located in the region they serve. Most operational activities of the Federal Government are distributed throughout the country.

A major exercise in decentralization from Washington took place in 1941 at the direction of President Roosevelt, because of the wartime

shortage of office space for emergency defense-related activities. Some 40 agencies or parts of agencies, and some 17,000 employees, were decentralized. The Bureau of the Budget, in appraising the effects of this large-scale transfer of activities, reached the conclusion that while it served the purpose of releasing office space for essential defense activities, it did so at considerable cost in terms of dollars, adverse results on employee morale, dislocation of current agency operations, and effective supervision by central office administrators. At the end of the war, most of the transferred agencies were brought back to Washington.

In 1950 and 1951, the then administration proposed legislation for (1) dispersal to the environs of the region of certain activities which should be kept relatively close to the Capital, and (2) permanent decentralization throughout the United States of activities for which proximity to the Capital was not believed essential for day-to-day operation. The plan for dispersal under this proposal was based on the directives of the National Security Resources Board. The Congress considered the administration proposed and disapproved it.

We do not recommend another across-the-board drive for decentralization in the light of past experience and in view of the present dimensions of decentralized administration in the Federal Government. Nevertheless, we believe that selective steps can and should be taken, where the facts support such action, to relocate activities which can carry on their operations effectively outside of Washington to the advantage both of the Federal Government and the National Capital area (a propitious time to consider decentralization is when new agencies or major new functions are being created). This responsibility should be exercised by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration in close cooperation with the heads of agencies.

The committee concludes that—

1. The Federal Government is already largely decentralized, with over 90 percent of its employees located outside the Washington, D.C., area.

2. Decentralization, while it deserves increased attention by department and agency heads, and can contribute to the orderly development of the metropolitan area, is not a panacea for the Washington space problem.

3. Policy guidelines should be adopted for use by the executive branch. These should emphasize criteria for determining the location of Federal activities.

4. A "crash" effort to decentralize is not desirable. Rather, the procedure should be deliberately selective and agencies should apply the criteria to their operations prior to the request for more space or facilities to carry on new or expanded activities or to consolidate existing activities.

5. The General Services Administration should utilize the general criteria in its continuing investigation of public building needs and providing for the construction and acquisition of buildings.

6. The Bureau of the Budget should continuously review and refine the criteria, conduct surveys to determine the effectiveness of agency practices, identify agencies or parts of agencies which fit the criteria for relocation, and review agency requests for new space and facilities in the light of the criteria.

7. The National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council should be guided by the criteria in reviewing department and agency proposals for new projects and installations within the area and in developing comprehensive plans for the development of the District and the National Capital region.

The following guidelines or criteria are suggested as aids in testing the feasibility of removing whole agencies or segments of agencies, such as bureaus or divisions, from the National Capital area. It is not possible to develop wholly objective tests. These criteria are meant to be only suggestive rather than conclusive. Knowledge and study of the experience of the agencies involved are required before these "principles" can be safely used in making substantive judgments concerning decentralization of particular activities. Each of the criteria needs to be carefully balanced and weighed in terms of (1) the needs of the executive branch as a whole and the Congress; (2) the needs of the agency itself; and (3) the needs of the clientele served by the particular activity.

With this caution against arbitrary application, the following criteria or principles provide a starting point in considering decentralization of specific Federal activities:

DECENTRALIZATION

A function is presumed to be susceptible to decentralization when—

1. It is engaged in operations to carry out established policies and programs within well-defined areas, such as administration of research and development contracts, and industrial and commercial activities, and requires only limited headquarters supervision.

2. It provides large-scale supporting services of a relatively repetitive or routine nature, such as (1) records maintenance; (2) procurement and inventory control; (3) training, including the operation of schools; (4) public works and maintenance, including administration of real property and related engineering services; (5) financial accounting and disbursing activities; and (6) statistics and data collection and related fact-gathering and processing operations.

3. It operates in a relatively self-sufficient manner having only limited intra- or interagency day-to-day working relationships.

4. It requires close coordination with other governmental (Federal, State, and local) and nongovernmental activities within a given geographical area.

5. It requires close coordination or working relationships with other Federal activities which are also susceptible to decentralization and could be moved to a common location outside of the National Capital area.

6. Small liaison offices in Washington could meet headquarters needs.

7. It consists of administration of functions in a particular region or other limited geographical area.

8. It is a direct service or other governmental function affecting citizen-clients in local areas of the country which can be administered in accordance with uniform national policies.

9. Other locations have available office space, and other necessary special facilities, housing for employees, and required community facilities without overburdening the jurisdictions affected.

10. Administrative economies (e.g., travel, communications, rental, recruiting) and efficiencies (e.g., speed of decisionmaking and service to the public, free headquarters staff for higher priority functions) can be achieved and costs of relocation are not unreasonable.

CENTRALIZATION

A function is not susceptible to decentralization when—

1. It is directed to meeting the needs of the President, the Congress, and agency heads for consultation, direction, and fixing of responsibility for governmental action.

2. It is concerned with establishing major national policies, developing broad principles and programs of national application.

3. It is of a regulatory or adjudicatory nature requiring uniformity of policy in ultimately dispensing rights or penalties.

4. It requires close coordination, working relationships, or communication with (a) other headquarters activities of the agency; (b) other headquarters agencies responsible for programs which could affect the activity; (c) the Congress; or (d) nongovernmental organizations.

5. It is concerned with exercising general supervision over agency operations throughout the country and assuring that these operations are in accord with general national policies.

6. It needs to be protected from undue influence or excessive accommodation at the local level to interest group pressures.

7. The costs of decentralization would clearly be excessive or prohibitive, including replacement of specialized physical facilities, and operating costs, including recruitment, training, relocation, travel, communications, and disruption of current operations.

8. Workload would not justify development of specialized staffs on a decentralized basis.

THE ROLE OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION IN SPACE ASSIGNMENT AND UTILIZATION

The problems which brought this Cabinet committee into being might not have arisen if a central staff agency with clear-cut responsibilities and adequate support had been able to perform an effective space management and planning program over the past decade. Such a program is a necessary feature of any comprehensive effort to overcome current office space deficiencies and develop a sound and economical buildings management program for the future.

The General Services Administration logically should bear this central responsibility. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 seems to give the necessary authority to the Administrator of General Services "to assign and reassign space of all executive agencies in Government-owned and leased buildings in and outside the District of Columbia upon a determination by the Administrator that such assignment or reassignment is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security." In fact, however, the GSA was not given complete and unqualified authority either for buildings and space management or for property management activities generally in the executive branch. The statute created an independent agency and merged into it a variety of long-

established service agencies, including the function of the National Archives, the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Public Buildings Administration, and the War Surplus Disposal Agencies. The statute was enacted only after extended debate and controversy over the issue of how much authority the new agency should exercise in taking over or regulating the property management activities of executive agencies. This issue was not settled by the act because the broad authority assigned to the Administrator was diluted by numerous exceptions and qualifications. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency were completely exempted and numerous specific programs were likewise exempted in the Departments of State and Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Weather Bureau, Maritime Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Farm Credit Administration, Post Office, and the Federal Aviation Agency. Similarly exempted were procurement actions under the Armed Forces Procurement Act. Finally, the Secretary of Defense was empowered, unless the President directed otherwise, to exempt the Military Establishment from actions taken by the Administrator of General Services.

Although the act has been amended to strengthen and clarify the Administrator's responsibility and authority for management of buildings and assignment of space, he is still limited by many qualifications and exemptions both in the Property Act and in other statutes. In order to accomplish his responsibilities, the Administrator must be able to obtain cooperation from executive agencies and, in addition, needs the sustained support of the President and of the Executive Office.

In several areas of its responsibility GSA has made excellent progress in accomplishing its program through persuasion, cooperation, and joint work programs with other executive agencies. The National Archives Service, for example, has accomplished excellent results without attempting to exercise regulatory authority. We believe these methods can and should be employed more extensively than in the past, especially in the management and assignment of buildings and space. The location, quality, and quantity of an agency's office space may have a substantial significance in the accomplishment of its basic program and in some instances may be a vital factor.

The Administrator should, moreover, exercise a broader management planning role on behalf of the President. We are convinced that buildings and space can be managed more efficiently and economically than in the past without injury to agency programs in a framework of long-range plans and performance standards and evaluation. Leadership and planning should be clearly assigned to the GSA with a provision for the resolution of specific interagency problems by the Executive Office of the President.

The committee will present separately, for the consideration of the President and review within the executive branch, a draft Executive order designed to accomplish these objectives, and to set forth basic management guidelines for the assignment and utilization of buildings and office space.

The committee believes that the GSA should give priority to the following activities, recognizing that office space is indeed an impor-

tant element of management and must be treated on a comprehensive basis:

1. The development of space standards and criteria for all departments and agencies.
2. Long-range plans and programs for the acquisition and use of space in the Washington area and in the field, for annual review and approval by the President.
3. Coordination of space requirements and plans with projections of expenditures and Federal employment by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.
4. Periodic management surveys of space utilization by the departments and agencies, related to the general standards which are formulated.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERAL ARCHITECTURE

In the course of its consideration of the general subject of Federal office space, the committee has given some thought to the need for a set of principles which will guide the Government in the choice of design for Federal buildings. The committee takes it to be a matter of general understanding that the economy and suitability of Federal office space derive directly from the architectural design. The belief that good design is optional, or in some way separate from the question of the provision of office space itself, does not bear scrutiny, and in fact invites the least efficient use of public money.

The design of Federal office buildings, particularly those to be located in the Nation's Capital, must meet a twofold requirement. First, it must provide efficient and economical facilities for the use of Government agencies. Second, it must provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government.

It should be our object to meet the test of Pericles' evocation to the Athenians, which the President commended to the Massachusetts Legislature in his address of January 9, 1961: "We do not imitate—for we are a model to others."

The committee is also of the opinion that the Federal Government, no less than other public and private organizations concerned with the construction of new buildings, should take advantage of the increasingly fruitful collaboration between architecture and the fine arts.

With these objects in view, the committee recommends a three-point architectural policy for the Federal Government:

1. The policy shall be to provide requisite and adequate facilities in an architectural style and form which is distinguished and which will reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American National Government. Major emphasis should be placed on the choice of designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought. Specific attention should be paid to the possibilities of incorporating into such designs qualities which reflect the regional architectural traditions of that part of the Nation in which buildings are located. Where appropriate, fine art should be incorporated in the designs, with emphasis on the work of living American artists. Designs shall adhere to sound construction practice and utilize materials, methods, and equipment of proven dependability.

Buildings shall be economical to build, operate, and maintain, and should be accessible to the handicapped.

2. The development of an official style must be avoided. Design must flow from the architectural profession to the Government, and not vice versa. The Government should be willing to pay some additional cost to avoid excessive uniformity in design of Federal buildings. Competitions for the design of Federal buildings may be held where appropriate. The advice of distinguished architects ought, as a rule, to be sought prior to the award of important design contracts.

3. The choice and development of the building site should be considered the first step of the design process. This choice should be made in cooperation with local agencies. Special attention should be paid to the general ensemble of streets and public places of which Federal buildings will form a part. Where possible, buildings should be located so as to permit a generous development of landscape.

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

One of the distinctive features of the American Republic is that from the earliest days the Nation's Capital has been located in an area set apart for that special purpose. No one visiting Washington can fail to recognize that the Government established here in the 18th century was something new in the world, and that the men who created it were fully conscious of the greater enterprise on which they had embarked.

The plans for the city of Washington, as drawn for the first President by Maj. Charles Pierre L'Enfant, began with the location of the principal buildings of the new Government and the great avenues that would connect them. The "grand axis" of the city, as of the Nation, was Pennsylvania Avenue leading from the Capitol to the White House, symbolizing at once the separation of powers and the fundamental unity in the American Government.

Just as the new Government was not founded on small aspirations, neither did Washington or L'Enfant make any little plans. The city they conceived was not intended to be completed in the life of one administration, or one generation. They designed the Capital of a great nation: building it would become the work of that Nation.

Scarcely a generation in our history has not contributed to this work. The appearance of the Nation's Capital has been a matter of continued concern to Congress, and to successive administrations. Down through the years, despite some lapses, those responsible have been essentially faithful to the original vision of Washington and his inspired city planner.

The modern era began with the report of the McMillan Commission at the beginning of the century which reiterated the essential principles of the L'Enfant scheme. The Commission plans called for the construction of the Mall, the Lincoln Memorial, the Arlington Bridge, and for a general development of public buildings in the area between the Capitol and the White House.

The most recent major development in the Capital took place under President Hoover and Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon who conceived the great Federal Triangle. This spacious and dignified complex of office structures occupies the area formed by Constitution Avenue, 14th Street, and Pennsylvania Avenue. As a result, all of

the space on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House is occupied by public buildings.

It was clear to the planners of the 1920's that the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue could not be developed while neglecting the north side. To develop one without the other would produce an imbalance wholly at odds with the spirit of L'Enfant. Accordingly, the plans for the Federal Triangle were accompanied by plans for a Municipal Center on the north side of the avenue extending from Third Street to Sixth Street, with John Marshall Place at the center. The architecture of the municipal buildings was to follow closely that of the Federal structures opposite.

Andrew Mellon expressed with great feeling the harmony of the scene he hoped to create:

It is easy to see what the effect will be. As one proceeds down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol, on the south side will be a succession of beautiful and harmonious buildings, all of a design in keeping with the semiclassical tradition so well established in Washington. On the north side vistas will be opened up, so that groups of buildings, such as the beautiful District of Columbia Courthouse, on John Marshall Place, shall be brought into the general plan of Pennsylvania Avenue. At the same time the Mall will present the spectacle of a great park bordered on one side by the new boulevard lined with beautiful buildings, a wide parkway of greensward with its four rows of trees, its drives and walks, statues, and reflecting pools, all arranged in such a way that long vistas will be opened up for views of the Capitol in one direction and of the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial in the other.

The plans for Pennsylvania Avenue were never fulfilled. The great depression prevented the completion of the facade of the Federal buildings (while the Main Court of the Triangle was left to become a parking lot of surpassing ugliness.) For various reasons, only about half the Municipal Center was constructed.

The result of the failure to fulfill this grand concept has been lamentable disharmony. On the south side of the avenue the stately progression of Federal offices designed under Andrew Mellon is twice interrupted by earlier structures of a quite different character. The north side presents a scene of desolation: block after block of decayed 19th century buildings, many of which are vacant above the first story, only rarely interspersed by partially successful efforts at modernization. The roadway, sidewalks, lamp posts, and other features of the avenue have been sorely neglected. Increasingly the Capitol itself is cut off from the most developed part of the city by a blighted area that is unsightly by day and empty by night.

Pennsylvania Avenue should be the great thoroughfare of the city of Washington. Instead it remains a vast, unformed, cluttered expanse at the heart of the Nation's Capital.

The present appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue demands attention for the precise reason that profound changes are about to take place. Large segments on the north side are decayed beyond restoration. It is clear that a great many of the buildings are about to be torn down and replaced by new structures which will include both private and public buildings.

This presents a great opportunity. From Washington's time there has been a general understanding that the Federal Government has a responsibility to maintain standards of buildings and architecture in the Nation's Capital. For the past half century this function has been ably performed by the Commission of Fine Arts. The prospect

that a considerable number of buildings will be erected along Pennsylvania Avenue in a short span of time makes it possible to consider the overall appearance, as well as the appearance of the individual structures. Instead of designing and constructing one new building at a time, it becomes possible to design and construct what would, in effect, be a new avenue.

This is an opportunity not to be missed. It will not come again for a half century or more, except at the prohibitive cost of demolishing large blocks of new and expensive office buildings.

At the same time it is clear that a dramatic transformation in the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue is possible with only a marginal increase in projected expenditure. The General Services Administration hopes to build a number of new buildings in the downtown area. The need for additional office space is such that it cannot be doubted that Congress will approve. There are equally good grounds to suppose that substantial private capital will be expended for hotels and office buildings in the downtown area. (It may be noted that Washington attracts over 15 million visitors a year.) Merely by combining these separate endeavors in one construction program a totality far more handsome, more truly functional, and more soundly economical may be achieved.

The committee feels there should be no delay in setting about this effort. Specifically, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the District government, should formally undertake the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue, so that it may assume its rightful place as the principal thoroughfare of the Nation's Capital.

The Pennsylvania Avenue project should be regarded as a continuation of the work on the Federal Triangle which began a generation ago. In this instance, however, the effort should involve a partnership between the Government and private enterprise. A primary object of the redevelopment of the avenue should be to emphasize the role of the Capitol itself as the center of the city. For this reason care should be taken not to line the north side with a solid phalanx of public and private office buildings which close down completely at night and on weekends, leaving the Capitol more isolated than ever. Pennsylvania Avenue should be lively, friendly, and inviting, as well as dignified and impressive.

As much attention should be paid to the 160-foot-wide avenue itself as to the buildings that line it. Much repairing and rearranging is in order. The object should be to produce an avenue on which it is pleasant to walk as well as possible to drive. Benches, arcades, sculpture, planting, and fountains should be encouraged.

In 1952, by act of Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission was created and designated as "the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof." It is clear that the central responsibility for planning the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue resides with the Commission. To fulfill this responsibility it will be necessary for the Commission to engage the services of a number of the foremost architects of the Nation: nothing less than the very finest, established talents available will be sufficient for this unusually significant undertaking.

Responsibility for the design and construction of new Federal buildings will, of course, remain with the General Services Administration, which should play a major role in the entire program. The Planning Commission will also wish to work in the closest cooperation with the Architect of the Capitol and the Commission of Fine Arts. They will also wish to work with the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Federal City Council, Downtown Progress, the American Institute of Architects, and the numerous other public and private organizations that will be concerned with this splendid challenge to the creative talents of all those concerned with the beauty and majesty of the Capital City of the United States of America.

